

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 2

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached replacement sheet of a drawing includes changes to Fig. 4, where reference number "310<sub>m</sub>" has been replaced with reference number "310<sub>n</sub>" and reference number "310<sub>m-1</sub>" has been replaced with "310<sub>n-1</sub>." The replacement sheet is intended to replace Fig. 4 currently before the Examiner.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 3

**Remarks**

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the Application.

**Drawings**

This response amends Figure 4 by replacing reference number "310<sub>m</sub>" with reference number "310<sub>n</sub>" and reference number "310<sub>m-1</sub>" with "310<sub>n-1</sub>." Support for this amendment can be, for example, found on page 4, line 10 of the specification.

**35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Elliott (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,781). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner is reminded that "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131 quoting *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Examiner is also reminded that "[the] identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." MPEP 2131 quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Elliott teaches each and every element as set forth in the rejected claims. In particular:

**Claim 1**

A. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Elliott discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

"a method of processing messages ... wherein the gatekeeper system includes a plurality of sub-processes each able to process a series of such messages ... dispatching the messages incoming on to the gatekeeper system onto the different sub-processes" (emphasis added)

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 4

The Examiner seems to asserts that "a gatekeeper system" as recited in Claim 1 is disclosed by Elliott's "gateway site 108." See page 3, line 3 of the Official Action. Although not clearly designated in the Office Action, the Examiner appears to consider the "sub-processes" recited in Claim 1 to be disclosed by Elliott's "trunking gateway 323," "access gateway 238," and "network access server 228." See page 3, lines 1-3 of the Office Action.

To address the Examiner's rejections, Applicant will presume that the Examiner considers the "sub-processes" recited in Claim 1 to be disclosed by Elliott's "trunking gateway 323," "access gateway 238," and "network access server 228." If that is not the case, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner comply with comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) and "designate as nearly as practicable" the particular part of Elliott relied upon in making the assertion that Elliott teaches "sub-processes" recited in Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion. According to Elliott, the gateway site "108" is able to provide trunk, private line and dedicated access line connectivity to the PSTN by sending an incoming message to either the trunking gateway "323," the access gateway "238," or the network access server "228." See column 25, lines 22-24 of the Elliott. That means that an incoming message requiring dedicated access line connectivity to the PSTN will not be forwarded to the trunking gateway "323," and an incoming message requiring trunk connectivity to the PSTN will not be forwarded to the access gateway "238." Therefore, the gateway site "108" is severely restricted to where each incoming messages can be sent.

Unlike Elliott's gateway site "108," the "gatekeeper system" recited in Claim 1 is not restricted to where messages can be sent, because, the "gatekeeper system" recited in Claim 1 "includes a plurality of sub-processes each able to process a series of ... messages" (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 1.

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 5

Because, for example, Elliott's gateway site "108" has to send all incoming messages with dedicated access line connectivity requirement to the access gateway "238," Elliott does not teach, disclose or suggest "dispatching the messages incoming on to the gatekeeper system onto the different sub-processes" (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 1.

Applicant submits that Elliott does not teach, disclose or suggest "wherein the gatekeeper system includes a plurality of sub-processes each able to process a series of such messages ... dispatching the messages incoming on to the gatekeeper system onto the different sub-processes" as recited in Claim 1. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-10 and 16, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

**B.** Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Elliott discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

"identifying whether a message belongs to a same call as a previous message, and , in that case, sending the message to the same sub-process as that to which the previous message was sent" (emphasis added)

The Examiner asserts that an exchange of full duplex information disclosed in Elliott, teaches "identifying whether a message belongs to a same call as a previous message, and, in that case, sending the message to the same sub-process as that to which the previous message was sent" as recited in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion for the following reasons.

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 6

It is not clear to Applicant as to what would be the point of checking whether or not the messages in Elliott's gateway site "108" belong to a same call as a previous message. As stated above, messages received by Elliott's gateway site "108" are sent to either the trunking gateway "323," the access gateway "238," or the network access server "228" based on the message's connectivity requirement. Irrespective of whether or not the messages in Elliott's gateway site "108" belong to the same call as a previous message, these messages will always be forwarded to the access gateway "238" if they require dedicated access line connectivity to the PSTN. Therefore, Elliott's gateway site "108" identifies a message based on the connectivity requirement, not whether it "belongs to the same call as the previous message" as recited in Claim 1.

Because Elliott sends messages to the trunking gateway "323," the access gateway "238," and the network access server "228" based on the message's connectivity requirement, Elliot does not teach, disclose or suggest "identifying whether a message belongs to a same call as a previous message" (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 1. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-10 and 16, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

C. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Elliott discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 1 of the present application:

"sub-processes" (emphasis added)

As stated above, Elliott's gateway site "108" uses the trunking gateway "323," the access gateway "238," and the network access server "228" to provide trunk, private line and dedicated access line connectivity to the PSTN. Applicant submits that gateways and servers are a combination of software and hardware. How can Elliott teach, disclose or suggest a "sub-process" as recited in Claim 1, when it discloses gateways and servers?

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 7

Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-10 and 16, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

#### Claim 11

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above, Elliot does not teach, disclose or suggest "the gatekeeper system hosting a plurality of sub-processes each able to process a series of messages, wherein the gatekeeper system is adapted to dispatch the messages onto those different sub-processes, and further wherein the gatekeeper system has means for identifying whether a message belongs to a same call as a previous message, and, in that case, sending this message to the sub-process that processed the previous message" as recited in Claim 11. Hence, Claim 11 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claim 12, at least based on its dependency on Claim 11, is also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

#### Claim 13

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above, Elliot does not teach, disclose or suggest "comprising means for dispatching messages incoming on that component onto a plurality of sub-processes, the component being able to identify whether a message belongs to a same call as a previous message, and, in that case, being able to send this message to the sub-process that processed said previous message" as recited in Claim 13. Hence, Claim 13 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 13-14, at least based on their dependency on Claim 13, are also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

#### Claim 15

A. Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above, Elliot does not teach, disclose or suggest "herein the gatekeeper system comprises a plurality of sub-processes

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 8

each able to process a series of such messages ... dispatching the messages incoming on the gatekeeper system onto those different sub-processes, the dispatching step including identifying whether a message belongs to the same call as a previous message, and, in that case, sending the message to the same sub-process as the previous message" as recited in Claim 15. Hence, Claim 15 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claim 17, at least based on its dependency on Claim 15, is also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

B. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Elliott discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 15 of the present application:

"messages enter the gatekeeper system in an encoded form" (emphasis added)

The Examiner concedes that an encoder/decoder "1108" disclosed in Elliott performs voice compression or packetization of incoming data signals. Just because the incoming data signals are compressed or packetized by the encoder/decoder "1108" does not mean that they enter "in an encoded form" as recited in Claim 15.

Elliott specifically teaches that "the media stream passes through a digital signal processor (DSP) 1108 to apply an appropriate compression algorithm." See column 67, lines 39-41 of Elliott. According to Elliott, the compression processing algorithm can take the media stream as a traditional stream from the traditional voice world. See column 67, lines 41-43 of Elliott. How can Elliott's teachings of the media stream being a traditional stream from the traditional voice world be considered as teaching "messages enter the gatekeeper system in an encoded form" as recited in Claim 15?

Applicant submits that Elliott does not teach, disclose or suggest "messages enter the gatekeeper system in an encoded form" as recited in Claim 15. Hence, Claim 15 is

Application No: 10/032,882

Page 9

patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claim 17, at least based on its dependency on Claim 15, is also believed to be patentable over Elliott.

C. Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Elliott discloses, suggests or teaches, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 15 of the present application:

"decoding the message only partially" (emphasis added)

As stated above, Elliott does not teach disclose or suggest "messages enter the gatekeeper system in an encoded form" as recited in Claim 15. Because Elliott does not teach an encoded message, how can it teach "decoding the message" as recited in Claim 15?

Applicant submits that Elliott does not teach, disclose or suggest "decoding the message" as recited in Claim 15. Hence, Claim 15 is patentable over Elliott and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claim 17, at least based on its dependency on Claim 15, is also believed to be patentable over Elliott.



Application No: 10/032,882

Page 10

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, fax no. (571) 273-8300 on

August 4, 2005  
(Date of Deposit)

Susan Papp  
(Name of Person Depositing)

Susan Papp  
Signature  
08/04/05  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinf

Alessandro Steinf  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 56,448  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, CA 90036  
(323)934-2300

Encl.: Figure 4  
Petition and Fee for Extension